De las

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Services of the date set forth below as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner For Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date of Signature

and Deposit: March 13, 2000

Carl R. Schwartz, Reg. No. 29,437

MAR 2 2 2000

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

James A. Thomson

Applicant: Serial No.:

09/106,390 June 26, 1998

Filed: Title:

PRIMATE EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit:

1633

Examiner:

Deborah Clark

Assistant Commissioner For Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

Attn: Box AF

Dear Sir:

In response to the January 14, 2000 Office Action in the above-described case, please enter the following:

Remarks After Final and Interview Summary

On March 6, 2000 a telephone interview regarding this application was held. Participating were the undersigned, Examiner Deborah Clark and SPE John LeGuyader. The only remaining issue in the case is a § 112 enablement rejection. This rejection was discussed in the interview.

The Office Action acknowledged that Applicant had developed pluripotent human embryonic cells capable of differentiation into derivates of all three embryonic germ layers cells. The only remaining issue therefore was whether in the context of "human embryonic stem cells" there must be a showing of germ-line-competence in order to confirm enablement.

Applicant contends that the rejection should be withdrawn because (a) the term "embryonic stem cell" was initially coined (and is still widely accepted) without reference to germ-line-competency in context of mouse embryos; (b) the term "human embryonic stem cells" was coined by the inventor in this case (Jamie Thomson) in the context of human embryonic stem cells, with the acceptance of the publication review process at Science and without reference to germ-line-